United Nations A/C.1/50/PV.23

General Assembly
Fiftieth session

Official Records

First Committee

23rd Meeting
Thursday, 16 November 1995, 10 a.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Erdenechuluun . . . . . (Mongolia)

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

Agenda items 57 to 81 (*continued*)

Action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman: At this meeting the Committee will proceed to take decisions on draft resolutions which appear in the following clusters: cluster 1, draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1 and A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2; cluster 3, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34; and cluster 10, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.43.

On draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.20/Rev.1 in cluster 11, which we agreed yesterday to take up today, I have just been informed that the programme budget implications are not yet ready but that the draft resolution could be taken up this afternoon. With the consent of the Committee I should like to propose that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.20/Rev.1 be taken up this afternoon.

It was so agreed.

The Chairman: Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on draft resolutions in cluster 1, I shall call on those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions. Are there any delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions?

There seem to be none.

I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements other than explanations of their positions or votes on draft resolutions in cluster 1.

Mr. Laptsenak (Belarus) (*interpretation from Russian*): I have asked to speak in order to make a statement on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2, entitled "Contribution to nuclear disarmament".

The fate of nuclear disarmament is a responsibility and a cause for all States, large and small, nuclear and non-nuclear, since the position of all States and their attitude to, participation in, and implementation of the commitments undertaken under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) are of fundamental importance for the achievement of the ultimate goal, the elimination of nuclear weapons.

We welcome the adherence of new States to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which took place after the conclusion of the work of the First Committee at the forty-ninth session of the General Assembly. The role of Belarus, Kazakstan and Ukraine, along with the other nuclear States, is well known as providing practical impetus to the implementation of the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

Equally important is the contribution made by Belarus, Kazakstan and Ukraine in ensuring the entry into force of the Treaty on the Reduction and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms. This was eloquently attested to by the support which those States have received from the international community.

95-86640 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

In dealing with the most important elements I should like to emphasize that the thrust of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2, entitled "Contribution to nuclear disarmament", constructively emphasizes the importance of the efforts of all countries in the cause of nuclear disarmament and the achievement of the ultimate goal of the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, and gives a positive impetus to further measures in this area.

Speaking as a co-sponsor of this draft resolution, we are counting on its adoption without a vote.

Mr. Fouathia (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): My delegation has asked to speak to express its views on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear disarmament".

My delegation has always supported efforts to achieve the praiseworthy objective of nuclear disarmament. In speaking today concerning draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, Algeria wishes to reaffirm its support for this objective. It wishes to do so particularly in the present circumstances, which are marked by the end of the East-West confrontation, which should, we believe, lead to a series of measures conducive to the emergence of a more secure world for all people, a world in which security will no longer be selective in nature.

By this draft resolution the non-aligned countries are seeking to give voice to a long-held wish, namely our desire for nuclear disarmament under a new aspect, thanks to the new dynamics resulting from the end of the cold war.

The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, despite all the criticism that that disarmament Treaty has had and continues to have because of its obvious imperfections — was none the less extended at the Review Conference. We believe that the draft resolution before the Committee today makes it possible for us to reiterate our support for the spirit that reigned when the Non-Proliferation Treaty was extended. It is designed to improve the Treaty by giving new encouragement to efforts to achieve nuclear disarmament by eliminating nuclear weapons according to a specific timetable.

By joining the other sponsors of the initiative my delegation is indicating its support for the vision recently described by the non-aligned countries at their Eleventh Summit, held in Cartagena de Indias, Colombia. Our sponsorship of the draft resolution also reflects our concept of nuclear disarmament, which must be universal in scope, and non-discriminatory in its effects. Nuclear disarmament must, we believe, lead to a release of the tremendous resources that have been used for this purpose but are none the less needed for the promotion of the fundamental right of all human beings to life and a decent existence, free of fear.

This must be a milestone on the way towards ensuring collective security, thereby enabling us to return to the nuclear-weapons-free world that existed before 1945. Was that not the objective set by the United Nations in 1945 in its first resolution on nuclear weapons? Was that not the objective that we reiterated in 1978 at the first special session devoted to disarmament?

Mr. Kanjanasoon (Thailand): My delegation wishes to speak on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear disarmament". We wish to inform this meeting that we are convinced that the adoption of this draft resolution, together with its three main components — namely the appeal to nuclear-weapon States to stop immediately the qualitative improvement, development, stockpiling and production of nuclear warheads and their delivery systems; the call to these States to undertake step-by-step reduction of the nuclear threat within a time-bound framework; and the call on the Conference on Disarmament to establish, on a priority basis, an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament — will be an important step forward towards the strengthening of international efforts to ensure the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

For this reason Thailand decided to become one of the many co-sponsors of the draft resolution. We render our full support to the draft and we hope that all other delegations will do the same.

Mr. García (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I should like to speak quite briefly on behalf of the members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and state that while draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, entitled "Nuclear disarmament", was not submitted by the Movement as such, it none the less has the broad support of the States members of the Movement, including my own.

We are convinced that, as indicated in this draft resolution, with the end of the cold war and the beginning of this new era, the time is now opportune for all nuclear-weapon States to carry out effective nuclear disarmament measures with a view to the total elimination of these weapons within a time-bound framework. So they must undertake gradually to reduce the nuclear threat and

successively reduce nuclear weapons in a well-balanced and progressive way.

Effective measures of nuclear disarmament must be adopted with a view to the total elimination of these weapons within a time-bound framework.

In both the preambular and the operative parts the draft resolution contains a mandate emanating from the Cartagena Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, calling on the Conference on Disarmament to establish, on a priority basis, an ad hoc committee to commence negotiations early in 1996 on a phased programme of nuclear disarmament and for the eventual elimination of nuclear weapons within a time-bound framework.

Finally, and this is a mandate I have received from the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, I should like to call upon the States members of the Non-Aligned Movement to give their fullest support to this draft resolution.

Mr. Moher (Canada): I should like to speak briefly this morning to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.15, "Prohibition of the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices". I am speaking on behalf of the 48 sponsors of this draft resolution.

Canada circulated the initial draft of this draft resolution widely very early on in the work of the Committee and invited comments thereon. In doing so we made our objectives very clear. We wanted a procedural draft resolution which encouraged the continuation of the process already initiated in the Conference on Disarmament. We also wished to avoid substance because we realized that this is a very complex and difficult issue to negotiate.

In moving forward with the draft resolution we agreed to some suggestions and were obviously open to more. I must emphasize that we appreciate sincerely the efforts made by all delegations to find a basis for a compromise on this draft resolution.

It is therefore with considerable regret that I have to inform the Committee that we have not been able to resolve all aspects of the questions that were raised during our discussions. Before concluding my comments, I should like to emphasize also our very deep appreciation to the 48 delegations that were prepared to endorse and to co-sponsor the draft resolution that we put forward in A/C.1/50/L.15.

However, as a result of the situation that I have described I must this morning inform the Committee that Canada, on behalf of the co-sponsors, is withdrawing A/C.1/50/L.15 from further consideration by the Committee at this session.

The Chairman: I am sure that representatives will have taken note of the fact that the representative of Canada has withdrawn draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.15.

Mr. Deimundo (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I wish to make a technical clarification with regard to the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.42, on transparency in armaments. Is this the proper time to do so?

The Chairman: I call on the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya on a point of order.

Mr. Mubarak (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya) (*interpretation from Arabic*): It is not merely a point of order. I should like to point out that we did not get the Arabic interpretation when the representative of Canada was speaking.

The Chairman: I thank the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya for drawing our attention to that fact. Do you have the Arabic interpretation now?

Let me just say once again that Canada has withdrawn draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.15.

I apologize to the representative of Argentina. He may now continue.

Mr. Deimundo (Argentina)(*interpretation from Spanish*): I was merely seeking clarification on a technical matter regarding the voting on the draft resolution on transparency in armaments. Should I do this at another time?

The Chairman: I would suggest that the representative of Argentina raise this technical issue at the end of the meeting.

Mr. Deimundo (Argentina)(*interpretation from Spanish*): Thank you.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I would like to make a brief statement on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, "Nuclear disarmament". The draft resolution, which was initiated by the delegation of

Myanmar and further developed by some interested delegations, enjoys the support of an overwhelming number of members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, including my own as a co-sponsor.

In my delegation's view, the draft resolution is one of a few important draft resolutions before the First Committee at this session, one that is timely and one that corresponds to real needs and requirements. We hope that at this session of the General Assembly the larger international community, in particular the Conference on Disarmament, will welcome the recommendations made in the draft resolution, and we hope that the Conference can agree at its 1996 session to establish an ad hoc committee on nuclear disarmament to commence negotiations. We also call upon all members of the First Committee to support the draft resolution.

Mr. Than (Myanmar): The name of Mauritius was omitted in the reissue of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1. I would request that the name of Mauritius be added to the list of sponsors of the draft resolution.

Turning briefly to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1 itself, I should like to stress that the draft resolution is the only resolution that addresses the question of nuclear disarmament in the most comprehensive and substantive manner. It reflects the commitment of the international community to nuclear disarmament and the aspirations of the peoples of the world for a world free of nuclear weapons.

As the Chairman of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries has already indicated, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1 enjoys the support of all the members of the Movement, although it cannot be submitted as a Non-Aligned draft resolution. Actually, support for the draft resolution extends well beyond the Non-Aligned Movement. I therefore urge all members of the First Committee to give overwhelming support to the draft resolution and to vote in favour of it.

The Chairman: The Secretariat has taken note of the omission of Mauritius from the list of sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I should like to say a few words with regard to the amendments to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.15, which was submitted by the delegations of Cuba, Egypt, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Myanmar and Pakistan and which were contained in document A/C.1/50/L.57. We appreciate the efforts of Canada and the other co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.15 to put forward an agreed draft resolution at this session on the issue of fissile material. Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.15 did touch on some substantive aspects of the subject.

As is well known, there are divergences within the Conference on Disarmament, specifically with respect to the scope of the treaty. My delegation and others have made serious efforts to reflect the genuine consensus in the consultations that were held at this session. Unfortunately, those efforts were not successful, and the six co-sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.1/50/L.57 were obliged to put forward those suggestions.

Now that we have heard the decision of Canada and the co-sponsors to withdraw draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.15, the co-sponsors of A/C.1/50/L.57 will also withdraw their amendments to that draft resolution.

The Chairman: We take note of the fact that the representative of Pakistan has informed us, on behalf of the co-sponsors, that the amendments contained in document A/C.1/50/L.57 are being withdrawn.

I now call upon delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): I should like to explain the forthcoming negative vote by the United States on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, "Nuclear disarmament". We will vote against that draft resolution because we read it as a creative but dishonest and destructive attempt to rewrite history.

The draft resolution takes selective quotes from earlier international documents and strings them together in a way that suggests that nuclear-weapon States have indeed undertaken commitments that they have not undertaken.

Particularly acrobatic is the tactic of selecting some of those particles or morsels from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons itself and from final documents that issued from the NPT Review and Extension Conference, which took place last May. But in doing so, the draft resolution very carefully avoids any reference whatsoever to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

The draft resolution would also have the General Assembly call upon the Conference on Disarmament to

undertake negotiations on nuclear disarmament. The Conference on Disarmament has been unable to do things that it has agreed to do because of the actions undertaken by the prime movers of this draft resolution.

If the proponents of the prestidigitation think they are advancing their own cause and the cause of nuclear disarmament by this draft resolution, they are mistaken. They are setting it back. I would urge all delegations to think about the real interests of the international community and not try to play games with a document that issued from a summit meeting of a small group and substitute words from that final document for agreed international treaties.

The Chairman: There are no further speakers in explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolutions in cluster 1.

The Committee will now take action on draft resolutions in cluster 1, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1.

I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, "Nuclear disarmament", was introduced by the representative of Myanmar at the Committee's 18th meeting on 10 November 1995. It was sponsored by the following States: Algeria, Angola, Bangladesh, Cambodia, Colombia, Cuba, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Fiji, Ghana, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Kenya, Malaysia, the Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, the Philippines, Samoa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Thailand, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam and Zimbabwe.

A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uzbekistan

Abstaining:

Antigua and Barbuda, Armenia, Australia, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Belarus, Benin, Croatia, Cyprus, Georgia, Japan, Kazakstan, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1 was adopted by 99 votes to 39, with 15 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2, "Contribution to nuclear disarmament", which was introduced by the representative of Ukraine at the Committee's 21st meeting on 15 November 1995. The draft resolution is sponsored by Belarus, Bangladesh, Ukraine, Australia, Monaco and the Marshall Islands. The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2 was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call upon those delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of vote.

Mr. Sha Zukang (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1. China has consistently advocated the complete prohibition and total destruction of nuclear weapons. In achieving that goal, the Chinese Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Qian Qichen, speaking at the forty-ninth session of the General Assembly, stated that the Chinese Government:

> "holds that a convention on the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons should be concluded in the same way as the conventions banning all biological and chemical weapons...under which all nuclear Powers should undertake the obligation to destroy all their nuclear weapons under effective international supervision". (*Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-ninth Session, Plenary Meetings, 8th meeting, p. 10*)

He also put forward a series of comprehensive and related nuclear-disarmament proposals.

On the basis of that position, China supports the purposes and objectives of the draft resolution. In our view, concrete steps for nuclear disarmament might be negotiated within the framework of a convention on the complete prohibition of nuclear weapons.

In the field of nuclear disarmament, countries that possess the largest and most sophisticated nuclear arsenals have special responsibilities and primary obligations. Of course, in our view some of the provisions of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1 might also be improved upon.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the Russian Federation supported the adoption, without a vote, of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2: "Contribution to nuclear disarmament", which reflects the positive developments in the field of nuclear disarmament that have taken place recently.

We feel obliged to note, however, that the references in operative paragraph 5 to the voluntary renunciation of nuclear weapons have no bearing on the substance of the issue of the possession of nuclear weapons by the former USSR. As we have noted on numerous occasions, following the collapse of the USSR the number of nuclear-weapon States did not change.

Mr. Richards (New Zealand): New Zealand abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, "Nuclear disarmament". It might be thought surprising that New Zealand, with its well-known active support for nuclear disarmament, both politically and in practical terms in negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament, should see fit to abstain on such a subject. It is, however, not so surprising when one studies the actual text of the draft resolution.

I do not want to waste the Committee's time by repeating remarks I made on behalf of New Zealand when explaining our abstention yesterday on another draft resolution dealing with a nuclear topic. Many of the arguments I used then are equally applicable to this explanation of vote.

To be helpful to the process of nuclear disarmament, draft resolutions submitted to the international community should have a balanced view of the circumstances they are covering. To do otherwise is to impose difficulties on many members of the Committee who, by their presence here, show themselves committed in good faith to the goals of nuclear and other disarmament.

It is not balanced to ignore the extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), which is one of the seminal events of the international community's efforts to control nuclear weapons, and it is not balanced to take no account of the need for urgency in completing a comprehensive test-ban treaty, which will be another major milestone on our way.

It is for these reasons, coupled with some of the points made yesterday, that New Zealand has found this text unhelpful and has accordingly recorded an abstention.

Mr. Starr (Australia): Australia abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1. As we have said previously in this Committee, Australia is firmly committed to a systematic process of nuclear disarmament. The objective of the elimination of nuclear weapons is at the core of Australia's policy. We believe that the strategic environment is such that it is now possible to map out concrete steps in order to achieve a world without nuclear weapons.

In view of our strong commitment to nuclear disarmament, we regret that we were unable to support this

draft resolution. While the draft resolution deals comprehensively with development, production, stockpiling and use of nuclear weapons, the lack of any reference to non-proliferation, and specifically to this year's decision by the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) to extend the Treaty indefinitely and to commit themselves to a declaration of Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament, including a reaffirmation of the goal of the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons, leaves the draft resolution unbalanced. The NPT provides the only legally binding framework in which all five nuclear-weapon States are bound to the process of nuclear disarmament.

We also have difficulties with reference to the Conference on Disarmament, a body whose prime task has to remain the negotiation of multilateral agreements. In particular, to ask the Conference on Disarmament to initiate negotiations early in 1996 on a programme for the elimination of nuclear weapons could disrupt and impede the finalization of two key steps towards the goal of the elimination of nuclear weapons, namely, the negotiation of the comprehensive test-ban treaty and a cut-off convention.

Ms. Kurokochi (Japan): I should like to explain Japan's abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, "Nuclear disarmamer ". Japan, with its unique past experience, honestly desires that the use of nuclear weapons, which would cause indescribable human suffering, should never be repeated. It thus attaches great importance to the efforts directed towards the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons.

By this draft resolution the General Assembly would call upon the nuclear-weapon States to undertake nuclear disarmament within a time-bound framework, but we understand that the draft resolution is not the product of coordination of the views of the countries concerned, such as the United States, the Russian Federation and other nuclear-weapon States. Japan, which seeks to promote nuclear disarmament by means of steady disarmament efforts, cannot regard the draft resolution as having been formulated on the basis of appropriate consideration and consultation. Furthermore, the draft resolution does not contain any reference to the highly important outcome of the Review and Extension Conference of Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, *inter alia* the decisions to extend the NPT indefinitely and to adopt the Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament. Japan therefore could not support it.

Mr. Lew (Republic of Korea): The Republic of Korea abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1, primarily because the text fails to refer to the results of the Review and Extension Conference of Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons last May, which we believe constitute the most important basis for future work on nuclear disarmament.

However, our abstention does not mean that my Government has reservations on the key thrust of the draft resolution. My delegation shares the basic rationale, importance and ultimate objectives of the draft resolution. We also believe that the highest priority in the nuclear-disarmament agenda should be given at this stage to the conclusion of the comprehensive nuclear test-ban treaty and the commencement of the negotiations on the treaty banning the production of fissile material.

The Chairman: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.46/Rev.1.

Mr. Moher (Canada): Would it be in order for me to make a brief comment with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.14, in cluster 2?

The Chairman: You may do so.

Mr. Moher (Canada): I should like to make a brief comment on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.14, which deals with the status of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction. In doing so, I speak on behalf of the 53 co-sponsors of the draft resolution.

Canada — and Poland, with whom we have worked very closely on this draft resolution — had hoped to put forward a procedural draft resolution that encouraged the continuation of work on the implementation of the Chemical Weapons Convention but which recognized that a series of difficult issues are being worked on in the Preparatory Commission at The Hague. In pursuing that objective, we had an extensive series of discussions with many delegations, up to and including discussions held yesterday afternoon.

I do believe that we have made considerable progress towards finding consensus on the draft resolution, and we appreciate the efforts and the contributions made by all delegations concerned. I must admit, however, that we were, in the final analysis, not able to resolve all questions.

I am therefore intervening this morning to serve notice of withdrawal of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.14. In doing so, I want to express once again Canada's deep appreciation of the support given to us by the 53 co-sponsors of A/C.1/50/L.14 and to emphasize our hope that developments at The Hague and in national capitals will enable us to take more positive action on this issue in the future.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I should like to make a brief statement concerning draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.14. Since the draft resolution has been withdrawn by its sponsors, I should like to inform the Committee, on behalf of the sponsors of the amendments in document A/C.1/50/L.54, that those amendments are not pressed for action.

Having said that, I should like to say that we had fruitful discussions on this important issue with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.14, but that unfortunately, as the Ambassador of Canada pointed out, we could not resolve some of the issues. However, that should in no way interrupt the work at The Hague, and we hope that our collective efforts there will lead to the early entry into force of the Convention and the resolution of all the outstanding issues, as reported to the First Committee at the current session by the Executive Secretary of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons. Our amendment simply draws on the some of the elements contained in the statement by the Executive Secretary, Mr. Kenyon, and is aimed at giving a more focused direction and purpose to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.14.

We will keep working to resolve outstanding issues with a view to having a draft resolution next year.

The Chairman: The Committee will now turn to cluster 3, which includes draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34.

I now call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34, "Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects", was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the Committee's 16th meeting on 8 November 1995. It is sponsored by the following States: Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Mongolia, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Paraguay, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34, I should like to place on record the following statement, which I make on behalf of the Secretary-General:

"By operative paragraphs 8 and 9 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34, the General Assembly would take note of the decision of the Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on Prohibition or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects to continue its work at resumed sessions in Geneva, from 15 to 19 January 1996 and from 22 April to 3 May 1996, and it would request the Secretary-General to continue furnishing needed assistance to the Review Conference.

"In that connection, the activity called for in operative paragraph 9 of the draft resolution is programmed in the proposed programme budget for the 1996-1997 biennium under section 2C.4, Disarmament. It appears under subprogramme 1, 'Deliberation and negotiation' of programme 7, 'Disarmament' of the medium-term plan for the period 1992-1997 as revised, hence provision of assistance to States Parties in rendering parliamentary services as well as depositary services would be carried out within resources approved under section 2 for the biennium 1996-1997.

"It should be noted that the resumed sessions of the Review Conference are conferences of States Parties to the Convention. As was the case in the past, conferences on multilateral disarmament treaties — for example, the Sea-bed Treaty, the Biological Weapons Convention, the Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Environmental Modification Convention — included in their rules of procedure provisions concerning the arrangements for meeting the costs of the conference. Under those arrangements, no additional cost was borne by the regular budget of the United Nations.

"Accordingly, the Secretary-General considers that his mandate under draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34 to provide the necessary assistance to the Review Conference has no financial implications for the regular budget of the United Nations with respect to conference servicing and associated costs which would be met under the financial arrangements to be made by the conferences of the Convention.

"Furthermore, all activities related to the international conventions or treaties that under their respective legal instruments are to be financed outside the regular budget of the United Nations may only be undertaken when sufficient resources to cover the activities in question have been received from the States parties in advance."

The Chairman: The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34 was adopted.

The Chairman: I shall now call upon those representatives who wish to explain their position.

Mr. Yativ (Israel): Israel acceded to the inhumane weapons Convention in March of this year. In doing so, against the background of the peace process and in view of the acute humanitarian problems of anti-personnel mines, Israel felt that it was both propitious and vital to commit itself to the important elements inherent in the Convention, and in Protocol II in particular.

Israel's motivation comes from a deep and sincere concern for, and appreciation of, the need to reduce and prevent suffering and to restrict the use of weapons that have indiscriminate effects. However, we feel that it is necessary to keep the proper balance between vital humanitarian concerns on the one hand and legitimate security concerns on the other, with the aim of preventing further suffering.

Joint action by the international community to prevent suffering as a result of the indiscriminate use of mines will in itself enhance mutual trust and confidence between nations and peoples. In this context, Israel reiterates its call to the regional partners to acceded to the inhumane weapons Convention as a regional confidence-building step, for the sake of security and mutual trust and as a sign of encouragement and hope for the future. Israel believes that accession to the Convention will have a supporting role at the regional level.

Mr. Esenli (Turkey): I should like to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34.

The Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects constitutes one of the cornerstone instruments in the field of disarmament. Turkey is a signatory to that Convention. It is apparent that the last Review Conference in Vienna could not be concluded because of the continuing disagreement on the future content of Protocol II. My delegation believes, therefore, that operative paragraph 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34 can become meaningful only if and when the Review Conference completes its work in the course of the resumed sessions in Geneva, which are scheduled for January and April 1996. However, in the spirit of compromise, we joined in the consensus.

Mr. Karem (Egypt) *(interpretation from Arabic)*: On 13 October 1995, the Vienna Review Conference on the Convention on Conventional Weapons (CCW) concluded its work without achieving any significant success towards the introduction of the proposed amendments relating to the problem of land-mines and booby traps to the second Protocol annexed to that Convention.

We can only view with regret the indecisiveness of the Review Conference, in which Egypt participated as an observer, although we have signed, but have not ratified the Convention. This indecisiveness has dashed the hopes many countries had pinned on the Conference with regard to the desired developing and strengthening of the provisions of the Convention on Conventional Weapons. The major cause for our regret and disappointment is the Conference's failure to introduce amendments that would urge the States parties to the Convention to provide assistance in mine clearance, a matter that cannot be overemphasized in view of the horrendous consequences from which innocent people continue to suffer in various parts of the world.

The Convention on Conventional Weapons is the binding international instrument that deals with the question of land-mines in all its aspects. Egypt believes that the most important of those aspects relates to the concerted action and mobilization of efforts required from the international

community towards the clearance of the land-mines planted in the soil of scores of States.

While the resolution on this Convention had called earlier for the accession of more countries to it, we maintain that it would have been more effective for the resolution to have called for the finalization, at the earliest possible opportunity, of the introduction of the proposed amendments to the Convention on Conventional Weapons. Those amendments should take into account the concerns, fears and interests of all countries without exception and accord priority to the endorsement of the amendments concerning the provision of assistance to the countries that are afflicted with the land-mines problem.

Mr. Sha Zukang (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation joined in the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34, on the Convention on certain conventional weapons.

The First Review Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects was convened in Vienna last September. The meeting considered seriously, and adopted, a protocol on blinding laser weapons. The meeting did not have a chance to complete its amendment to the protocol on the use of mines. However, thanks to the work of the four meetings of the Group of Experts at the current session of the General Assembly, progress was made in the negotiations. In addition, all sides gained a more profound and complete understanding of the position of others, which will be very beneficial to our future work.

China was active, serious and responsible in participating in the negotiations in Vienna, and we did our best to make compromises. China is in favour of improving the Protocol on mines. At the same time, we believe that in the process of amending the Protocol, we should try our best to achieve a balance between international military needs and humanitarian needs. What we are faced with is a complex political, military, humanitarian and legal problem. The parties to the solution of this problem have vast differences in their levels of development, security environments and other related areas. This is the reality we have to face.

China hopes that at the resumed sessions in January and April next year, all sides will be flexible and pragmatic and will enter into a spirit of compromise in resolving existing problems. We hope also that they will live up to the expectations of the international community and will achieve the greatest possible reduction in the injuries inflicted by mines on innocent civilians.

The Chairman: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of position on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.34.

The Committee will now move on to cluster 10.

The Committee will proceed to take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.43.

I call on those delegations wishing to explain their position on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.43.

Mr. Calovski (the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia): I should like to make a very brief statement on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.43, on "Development of good-neighbourly relations among Balkan States".

First, the sponsors of A/C.1/50/L.43 would like to propose that the draft resolution be adopted without a vote. It is a consensus draft resolution which, I am sure, enjoys the approval of all delegations.

Secondly, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.43 addresses the future relations among Balkan States and the integration of all Balkan countries into Europe. For that reason, in my previous statements I have underlined the need for the Europeanization of the Balkans, and not its further Balkanization. In that most important endeavour, the development of good-neighbourly relations among all Balkan States can play the most important role.

It is fitting to note that the draft resolution has been co-sponsored by all States members of the European Union. That signifies their confidence that the aim of the draft resolution, the speedy integration of all Balkan States into Europe, is a realistic one. All Balkan States, for political, economic, cultural, social and, of course, security reasons, would like to become members of the European Union as soon as possible. I hope this stated wish and need of all Balkan States and peoples will become a reality in the not-too-distant future.

We look forward to this and also to the important report of the Secretary-General requested in operative paragraph 7 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.43.

The Chairman: No other delegation has asked to make a statement before action is taken on the draft resolution.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.43, entitled "Development of good-neighbourly relations among Balkan States", was introduced by the representative of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia at the 17th meeting of the Committee, on 9 November 1995. It is sponsored by the following States: Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey and the United Kingdom.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.43 was adopted.

The Chairman: I shall now call on any representatives who wish to make a statement on the action just taken.

Mr. Bandura (Ukraine) (*interpretation from Russian*): I am speaking in order to thank all delegations for supporting draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.50/Rev.2, which was adopted today without a vote.

From the very first day of the proclamation of its independence, Ukraine has carried out a very consistent policy in the area of nuclear disarmament, having proclaimed its renunciation of nuclear weapons in its declaration of State sovereignty, even before the collapse of the former Soviet Union. We fully support the idea of the achievement of general and complete nuclear disarmament.

We are most gratified that these steps, as well as those of other newly-independent States, such as Belarus and Kazakstan, have been appropriately assessed today by the First Committee. This attests to the positive changes that have taken place in the world since the end of the cold war, and to the possibility of building, in the next century, a world without nuclear weapons.

I should like also to emphasize that the unwavering and consistent policy of my country has played a significant role in assuring that no new nuclear States have emerged on the map of the world.

The Chairman: Before adjourning the meeting, I should like to inform representatives that this afternoon the Committee will proceed to take a decision on the draft resolutions listed in the following clusters:

In cluster 1: the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.3;

In cluster 8: the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.13 and its amendments, which are contained in document A/C.1/50/L.53; and draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.48;

In cluster 7: A/C.1/50/L.28/Rev.1. Revision 1 will be available to all delegations this afternoon.

I call upon the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): There will be a meeting of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.42: "Compliance with arms limitation and disarmament agreements" at 3 p.m. today in conference room C.

The meeting rose at 12.30 p.m.

United Nations A/C.1/50/PV.24

General Assembly
Fifth session

Official Records

First Committee
24th Meeting
Thursday, 16 November 1995, 3 p.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Erdenechuluun ..... (Mongolia)

The meeting was called to order at 3.40 p.m.

Agenda items 57 to 81 (*continued*)

Action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman: At this meeting the Committee will proceed to take decisions on the following draft resolutions: in cluster 1, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3; and in cluster 8, draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.13 and the amendments to it contained in document A/C.1/50/L.53; and draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.48.

Upon the request of a number of delegations the Committee will defer action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.28/Rev.1, in cluster 7, to a later date.

I shall now call on those delegations wishing to make statements on draft resolutions in cluster 1.

Mr. Edwards (Marshall Islands): I wish to reaffirm the statements my delegation has made at the Special Commemorative Meeting of the General Assembly, in other plenary meetings and in this Committee. I reiterate the urgent and heartfelt appeal of my Government to delegations here at the United Nations to consider draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 in a favourable manner. It is our view that the draft resolution is balanced and to the point. It does not condemn any people or Government; it does not attack or undermine any country's role in international relations. It merely points out that a certain action is wrong, and that it must be stopped.

As I stated earlier in this Committee, any single nuclear weapons test anywhere is one test too many. Any single nuclear test in the Pacific adds to the burden we in the Marshall Islands will face in the future.

In particular we appeal to those developing countries which have come under immense pressure owing to the threats of a certain country, which has threatened to withhold assistance to them should they vote in favour of this draft resolution. Our eyes will be upon them, we will hold every delegation accountable for its decision on this issue.

Marshall Islands is a sponsor of this draft resolution because we recognize that what is occurring is simply wrong, and we must put a stop to it.

Mr. Samana (Papua New Guinea): I wish on behalf of Papua New Guinea to make a statement on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, on nuclear testing. Papua New Guinea wishes to congratulate and thank the sponsors and supporters of this important draft resolution, on which action is about to be taken. The draft resolution clearly reflects the overwhelming global opinion against nuclear testing in any part of the world. It also dispatches the strong message to the countries involved in current nuclear testing that the international community neither welcomes nor approves of their outdated, digressive and intolerable behaviour.

The international community, for the sake of our common vision and in the hope of stability, and for the protection of our common human heritage, the protection of our environment, our families, our women and children,

95-86702 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

our livelihood and survival and a sustainable living, must agree to send the clear message that it is against nuclear testing anywhere in the world. The money that goes to support this horrendous experiment that deprives people of their basic livelihood is being spent in a way that runs counter to the purposes and principles for which the United Nations stands and to the universal values to which we all adhere: unity, friendship and fraternal relations among all peoples and States.

I wish therefore to reiterate what my delegation said when this draft resolution was first submitted: that a vote in support of the draft resolution is a vote against intolerance, a vote against those who dare to threaten international peace and security, a vote against those whose actions threaten our national, regional and global environment and ecosystem, and a vote against the abuse of political power against humanity. A positive vote for the draft resolution is a vote for peace, a vote for a future based on confidence. A positive vote is a vote for tolerance, a vote for the protection of our environment and a vote for humanity.

We call upon members to vote in favour of the draft resolution, in the name of moral courage and good conscience, in the name of international solidarity and universalism, to pave the way for a new moral order, to promote and not havoc, to promote human development and not human destruction, and to ensure good will among all peoples and nations. A positive vote for this draft resolution will once again remind the countries involved in nuclear testing to heed global opinion against nuclear testing.

Finally, we appeal to the States represented in this Committee to reject archaic and outdated policies and support global consensus on nuclear non-proliferation by voting in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3.

Mr. Starr (Australia): Before action is taken on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, on nuclear testing, I would like to make a brief statement. There has been a full debate on this subject in the First Committee; there is no need to add much to it. The draft resolution has been before us for more than two weeks and has presumably been considered by all. This draft resolution is simple. Its core is the call upon those States which continue to conduct nuclear tests to stop immediately. As I said in my earlier statement on this subject, the word "immediate" signifies a unique point in time. That time is now.

This draft resolution has a broad and diverse range of sponsors, but beyond this, it gives expression to the view expressed by peoples all around the world that now is the time for all nuclear testing to cease. That same view has been strongly endorsed at a number of major international meetings in recent months. More than 50 Commonwealth Heads of Government, meeting in Auckland last week, condemned continuing nuclear testing and urged its immediate cessation. Heads of State or Government of the Non-Aligned Movement, meeting in Cartagena three weeks ago, strongly deplored the resumption and continuation of nuclear testing and called on all nuclear-weapon States to cease conducting any nuclear testing.

States parties to the nuclear-weapon-free-zone Treaties of Rarotonga and Tlatelolco, at a joint meeting in New York in September, rejected continued nuclear testing and demanded that those States which continue to test join the other nuclear-weapon States in observing a moratorium. Leaders of the countries of the South Pacific Forum, meeting in Papua New Guinea in September, expressed their extreme outrage at the resumption of nuclear testing in the Pacific and demanded that it end.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 gives expression in this General Assembly to precisely what has been called for by the peoples of the world and endorsed by the overwhelming majority of States Members of the United Nations outside this Assembly. We must bring into this forum what we have stood for outside it.

Mr. Tello (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The Committee will soon take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, by which the General Assembly would strongly deplore nuclear testing and strongly urge its immediate cessation. This is an opportunity for the international community, through its representatives here, to reaffirm that given the easing of international tension and the strengthening of trust between States the continued development of nuclear arsenals is no longer permissible or tolerable. It is also an opportunity for the international community to reaffirm its commitment to nuclear non-proliferation in all its aspects and to the process of nuclear disarmament with the ultimate objective of eliminating these weapons, the very existence of which poses a threat to the survival of mankind. Above all, it is an opportunity to help create the propitious climate necessary for the prompt conclusion of a treaty prohibiting completely and for ever all nuclear-weapons tests, a goal we have been pursuing for more than three decades, and which now appears to be within our grasp.

And finally, it is an opportunity for delegations to reiterate in the United Nations the concern of their peoples

and Governments about the possible ill effects of underground nuclear tests on health and the environment.

We appeal to all delegations to seize these opportunities by voting in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3. Not to do so will entail serious responsibilities. It would, for instance, be serious to accept the reasoning that the current tests will permit the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty because they will make it possible to develop the technology necessary to improve nuclear weapons without the need to test them. Such reasoning calls into question the usefulness of a comprehensive test-ban treaty with respect to qualitative non-proliferation. This lack of credibility will undoubtedly prolong the negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty, to which we all say we are committed.

It would also be serious to accept the assertion that nuclear tests are harmless and safe in the absence of convincing evidence from independent, impartial international specialized institutions. It would be serious — very serious — to affect, by omission, the credibility of the international non-proliferation regime and thus fuel a nuclear arms race, which should be a thing of the past.

Finally, it would be serious because we would lack moral authority in the future in declaring ourselves against nuclear weapons tests anywhere, or in calling on any country from any region which has not yet done so to join the international non-proliferation regime.

Let us not take on such a serious responsibility. Let us take this opportunity to say loud and clear that we reject nuclear weapons testing and that this must cease immediately.

Mr. Bune (Fiji): Fiji will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3. The draft resolution reflects the genuine anguish of Fiji and many other countries over current nuclear testing. It is measured and balanced. As much as we would have liked a stronger text, in the interests of securing broad support we have joined the list of sponsors. We would like to emphasize that the draft resolution is not anti-government and certainly not anti-people. Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 is simply a statement that nuclear testing is wrong and must be stopped now. It is important that the draft resolution be adopted with universal, broad-based support.

Just as we were united 36 years ago in this very Committee in stopping nuclear testing in the Sahara, I urge members to unite in voting in favour of this draft resolution to put an end to nuclear testing in our part of the world. In so doing, members will join many others who want to make a real contribution to global nuclear disarmament.

The Chairman: I call now on delegations wishing to make statements in explanation of vote before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3.

Sir Michael Weston (United Kingdom): I wish to explain the position of the United Kingdom with respect to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, on nuclear testing. The United Kingdom has not conducted a nuclear-weapon test since 1991, and I can confirm again that we have no plans to test in the future. We understand public concern about nuclear testing. However, the United Kingdom will vote against draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 because we consider it to be seriously deficient in a number of respects.

First, the fourth preambular paragraph is a gross misrepresentation of the facts. When the document on Principles and Objectives was being negotiated at the Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) earlier this year, many delegations had wanted to include an undertaking on an immediate cessation of testing. At least two of the nuclear-weapon States made clear that they were not in a position to accept such an undertaking at that time, in one case because they intended to complete a series of tests already under way, and in the other because they were obliged to reserve their position on a possible resumption of testing for a limited period.

Because of those positions, no undertaking to cease testing immediately was included in the Principles and Objectives adopted by the Conference. Instead, it was agreed that the nuclear-weapon States should exercise utmost restraint pending the entry into force of a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

There are therefore no grounds for the allegation in the fourth preambular paragraph that nuclear testing *per se* is not consistent with undertakings by the nuclear-weapon States at the NPT Review and Extension Conference. All the nuclear-weapon States, together with all other NPT States parties participating in the Review and Extension Conference, at the same time acknowledged the importance of the completion of the negotiations at the Conference on Disarmament on a universal and internationally and effectively verifiable comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty no later than 1996.

We welcome this and we believe that the early conclusion of such a treaty is now in sight. We regret the fact that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.3 makes no mention of the good progress being made in the comprehensive test-ban treaty negotiations, nor of the importance attached by all five nuclear-weapon States, as well as the other participants, to the conclusion of these negotiations as soon as possible and no later than in 1996, as reflected in the Report of the Conference on Disarmament to the General Assembly. While the United Kingdom will continue to work hard for an early and successful conclusion of the negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty and hence for an early cessation of nuclear-weapon tests, we cannot subscribe to the views expressed in operative paragraphs 2 and 3 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, nor do we subscribe to the views expressed in some other preambular paragraphs. These include the fifth preambular paragraph, since we believe that underground testing, when properly conducted, does not have the negative effects on health and the environment alluded to in that paragraph.

For all these reasons, the United Kingdom will vote against the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/50/L.3. Since the representative of Australia referred in his statement a moment ago to the Commonwealth statement on disarmament issued at the Commonwealth Heads of Government meeting in Auckland on 10 November 1995, I should like to recall that the British Prime Minister made clear in the meeting of Heads of Government that the United Kingdom could not associate itself with the fifth paragraph of the statement on disarmament concerned with nuclear testing. He said that in the view of the British Government, this paragraph was both factually inaccurate and seriously misrepresented an important subject.

Mr. Mabilangan (Philippines): Before us today is a draft resolution which is as timely as it is important. This draft resolution represents the valiant and sincere efforts of many who have sincerely placed themselves against nuclear tests and weapons of mass destruction. In its current state, the draft resolution achieves much of what those of us who began this endeavour had hoped for. For many of us, it appears that the draft resolution as it stands is more than satisfactory. For others, the draft resolution is unacceptable for it falls short of singing the praises of nuclear testing and their precepts of geopolitics and nuclear deterrence. For my delegation, the draft resolution against nuclear testing is most desirable and, if only for that reason, we are not going to vote against it.

It is clear, on the face of it, that the resolution contains strong language against nuclear testing. That in itself is a welcome development. It is also heartening to see that attempts by others to introduce language that practically welcomes nuclear testing did not succeed. However, the original stronger language which was initially supported by a number of countries and which my delegation fought for has been discarded, ostensibly to gain support for the draft resolution.

The Philippines does not subscribe to the belief that this draft resolution would be made more meaningful by sheer force of numbers alone. Its true meaning will be in its substance and in the forcefulness of its stand in condemning nuclear testing. We believe that the issue of nuclear testing is not one which States can hide from by obscuring what should be said. The issue of nuclear testing is of such critical importance that States have to take sides. States have to make clear their positions. The tragedy in all this is perhaps that although the cold war has ended, the weapons that fostered it and the attitudes that sustained it still plague us. It is hoped that the substance of the message in this resolution and the spirit of compromise that has been shown by many on this issue will serve to convince those that conduct nuclear tests and those with nuclear-testing programmes, even those that pretend not to be involved with the corruption of the atom, to end all nuclear testing.

Mr. Zainuddin (Malaysia): My delegation would also like to take this opportunity to explain our position before the Committee takes action on the very important item before us this afternoon with regard to the question of nuclear testing as contained in document A/C.1/50/L.3. We appreciate the initiative undertaken by the sponsors of this draft resolution to bring to the attention of this Committee the issue of nuclear testing, which to us undermines international peace and security.

It is outrageous that in the face of the overwhelming international opposition and widespread protests against the resumption of these tests, nuclear tests have continued. The conducting of these nuclear tests in quick succession makes a mockery of the commitment to the exercise of "utmost restraint" that was solemnly entered into during the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Malaysians, in all walks of life, are angered by this testing and have appealed to the peoples of the world, including those in States conducting these tests to insist that their Governments desist from this testing. The Malaysian Parliament has unanimously condemned these tests. Our delegation also had the privilege to submit to the

International Court of Justice earlier this month a statement on the need to outlaw the use or threat of the use of nuclear weapons. The overwhelming majority of Commonwealth leaders have unequivocally condemned this testing and called for its immediate cessation.

In the light of these deep concerns, we would have preferred stronger language, especially in operative paragraph 2, which should have called for condemnation of the current nuclear testing. We find the present formulation, which only "strongly deplores", unsatisfactory. Hence, Malaysia is only able to vote in favour of this draft resolution but not to co-sponsor it. We hope that by the time the plenary Assembly meets, the international community will be prepared to support the need for stronger language.

Mr. Cassar (Malta): Malta has a consistent and unequivocal position on the question of nuclear weapons. We strongly encourage and support all measures aimed at nuclear disarmament. We are party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and have urged the early conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. This policy is an integral part of our overall policy on disarmament issues, on which we are supportive of effective measures aimed at reducing the levels of all armaments. We support and encourage disarmament measures in Europe and the Mediterranean in the framework of broader confidence- and security-building measures. We recognize and appreciate the endeavours of nuclear-weapon States to promote peace and stability. We welcome the indefinite extension of the NPT and their contribution to the efforts to reach a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

In casting its vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, Malta would like to express its reservation on the fourth preambular paragraph. Malta feels that this paragraph does not correctly reflect the undertakings by the nuclear-weapon States at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Malta stresses its desire for the early conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, and acknowledges and welcomes the commitment of all nuclear-power States to agreement on such a step.

Mr. Sha Zukang (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): The Chinese delegation has carefully studied the draft resolution on nuclear testing (A/C.1/50/L.3) and has listened attentively to the views expressed by various delegations.

Before the Committee takes action on this draft resolution, I wish once again to explain the Chinese delegation's position on the question of nuclear testing. I emphasize that the Chinese Government's position on this matter is consistent and clear-cut.

The Chinese Government has always exercised the utmost restraint in nuclear testing. During the period of the cold war the two countries with the largest and most advanced nuclear arsenals conducted about 1,000 nuclear tests each, in their rivalry for supremacy and their nuclear-arms race. China, for its part, has never participated in the nuclear-arms race. It did not do so during the cold war, when the United States and the former Soviet Union were heatedly engaged in that race, and it has not done so subsequently. Indeed, it has consistently stood for the complete prohibition and complete destruction of nuclear weapons, as well as for the complete prohibition of chemical and biological weapons.

China has also exercised the utmost restraint in the development of nuclear weapons, and its stocks of such weapons have always been kept at a minimum. The number and scale of its nuclear tests, too, have been kept at the lowest level. In fact, the total number of tests carried out by China during the past 30 years equals only the average number conducted by some nuclear Powers in just one year.

Having been repeatedly subjected to the nuclear threat by certain nuclear Powers, and in view of the fact that these Powers maintain their policy of nuclear deterrence, China has conducted a limited number of nuclear tests, and it possesses a small stock of nuclear weapons, solely for the purpose of self-defence.

China opposes hegemony, and it pursues an independent foreign policy of peace. China is not allied with any major Power, nor does it belong to any such military bloc. Being independent and self-reliant in the field of national defence, China has no foreign nuclear umbrella. It has never harmed any other country. On the contrary, it was repeatedly subjected to invasion and occupation by imperialists of the world before the founding of the People's Republic, and on many subsequent occasions certain Powers threatened it with nuclear weapons.

China does not want to be harmed again. It believes that all countries should have a right to maintain an appropriate capacity for national defence and legitimate self-protection. Precisely because of its own experience, China does not base its security on a nuclear threat against

other countries. Indeed, it is resolutely opposed to the policy of nuclear deterrence. As China's nuclear weapons are not directed against any other country, they do not constitute a threat to any State.

There is no question of our threatening international peace and security. Long ago China gave an unconditional undertaking that it would not be the first to use nuclear weapons, and it gave all non-nuclear-weapon States an unconditional assurance that it would not use or threaten to use nuclear weapons against them. Besides, China was one of the first nuclear-weapon countries to undertake international legal commitments in respect of the nuclear-free zones of Latin America and the South Pacific.

China consistently supports the goal of a comprehensive ban on nuclear-weapon tests, within the framework of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of all nuclear weapons. We are pleased to note that gratifying progress has been made in the negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. China supports the conclusion of a reliable comprehensive test-ban treaty that would truly ban all nuclear-weapon-test explosions as soon as possible, and no later than 1996, and it will continue to engage with the other countries concerned in a common effort to achieve that goal.

China sincerely believes that the fundamental approach to the realization of a comprehensive test ban should be through the early conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty and its entry into force as soon as possible. I wish to state once again that upon the entry into force of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, China will cease nuclear-weapon-test explosions.

China understands the legitimate concerns expressed by many non-nuclear-weapon States about nuclear testing, and it wishes to thank all those countries that appreciate and sympathize with its position. Needless to say, the Chinese delegation has serious reservations about some elements of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, which will be put to a vote. We believe that the adoption of such a draft resolution would not help to create an atmosphere conducive to success in the negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty. Indeed, it would only damage such negotiations.

In these circumstances, the Chinese delegation will have to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): I wish to explain why the United States will abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3.

The United States Government is committed to a nuclear-testing moratorium. We imposed a testing moratorium on ourselves three years ago, and we have consistently advocated that all nuclear-weapon States observe moratoriums during the negotiations on the comprehensive test-ban treaty. We firmly believe that this is the way to create and enhance the political atmosphere most conducive to rapid success in the nuclear-test-ban negotiations. Accordingly, the United Nations regrets both the Chinese and the French tests that have taken place.

None the less, we cannot support draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3. We do not believe that its tone and content would contribute to the achievement of our common objective of securing a comprehensive test-ban treaty early in 1996. This is regrettable. We should have greatly preferred a moderate and dispassionate anti-testing draft resolution that we could have supported. However, that is not what the sponsors came up with.

The United States does not support the assertion, in the fourth preambular paragraph, that testing is not consistent with undertakings by the nuclear-weapon States at the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Indeed, the language of that Conference regarding the utmost restraint was compromise language reflecting well-known facts — that China would continue to test, and that France was keeping its options open in the run-up to the then forthcoming elections. Those of us who participated in the negotiations on the Final Document of the NPT Conference know this.

The supposition, in the fifth preambular paragraph, that underground nuclear testing has negative effects on health and the environment goes too far for my delegation.

We are reluctant to make such judgements on the effects testing will have on the environment and health without first seeing relevant evidence.

As for operative paragraph 2, the United States cannot join in strongly deploring all current nuclear testing, for the reasons already mentioned.

Again, concerning operative paragraph 3, which "strongly urges immediate cessation of all testing", we thought that a phrase such as "as soon as possible" or "at the earliest possible time" might have moderated the tone of the draft resolution.

Finally, the draft resolution makes no reference to the good progress in the negotiations on the comprehensive test-ban treaty in the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva. This is the vehicle for a total and final ban on all nuclear testing. We hope that that will come about by concluding the treaty in April next year.

My Government regrets that its efforts to seek a more moderate draft resolution did not meet with success. We also regret, consequently, that the United States is compelled to abstain.

Mr. Dlamini (Swaziland): I will just take a second to speak on behalf of the Swaziland delegation.

What concerns our delegation here is the thrust of the draft resolution and the effects it has and may have. Let us not be circumvented here. The time to tell the truth is now. The time to tell the truth about the nuclear testing is now. Whether testing is done by a small country, a poor country or a rich country, and as long as, in the final analysis, it violates the principle of peaceful coexistence within any country's neighbourhood, the time has come for the United Nations to condemn it.

Let us then not, as a United Nations body, compromise the truth. Nuclear weapons are a threat wherever they may be on this planet. My delegation therefore will never agree with or support views, no matter where they come from, that compromise the truth concerning the testing of nuclear armaments.

Mrs. Bourgois (France) (*interpretation from French*): The First Committee is about to vote on a draft resolution regarding nuclear testing. My country will vote against it. French policy is the target pursued by the instigators of this draft. That policy is legitimate.

What does France want? It wants to safeguard its national independence and help to further the cause of peace. What is it doing? It is completing a nuclear-testing programme that is strictly limited, both in terms of duration and in terms of the number of tests carried out. This programme is aimed at maintaining the credibility of its deterrence force, which contributes to its own security and, beyond, to that of Europe.

Simultaneously, France commits itself to conclude, as soon as possible, a comprehensive and definitive nuclear-test-ban treaty. France was the first among the nuclear Powers to make this commitment and has opted for the zero option.

The text submitted to this Assembly is based on false statements and unfounded assertions. Everyone here knows that the nuclear-weapon States, during the Review and Extension Conference of the States Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), never committed themselves to putting an immediate end to their nuclear testing. "Utmost restraint" means neither prohibition nor suspension. Words mean what they mean. Furthermore, France has stated clearly that it retains its right to conduct nuclear tests. This was said in May. To suggest the contrary today is simply untrue.

Everyone knows that the precautions we have taken, the scientific studies that have been conducted and the transparency we have accepted prove the harmlessness of the French experiments. To refer to "negative potential effects ... on health and the environment" is an unfounded assertion.

I urge us all to think. What will be the outcome of such a resolution? How will it contribute to the United Nations credibility? What are the risks at stake?

The outcome: France will keep to its course. It will put an end to its tests very soon, but it will do so because it committed itself to do so and because it has spared no efforts to conclude the comprehensive test-ban treaty as soon as possible.

The credibility: An emotional and polemical atmosphere has prevailed over our Committee's work. Precious time has thus been wasted while we have failed to deal with concrete issues of non-proliferation and disarmament, including nuclear disarmament.

The risks: The draft will give substance to the idea that the NPT could go unimplemented, even though it has just been extended indefinitely.

This draft resolution, along with other attempts of the same kind now under way, will contribute to undermining the very achievements we should strengthen. The negotiation of the comprehensive test-ban treaty will be made all the more difficult. By not urging a speedy conclusion of this treaty, by 30 June 1996 if possible, this draft resolution will allow certain countries to take a stand today, the better to evade the issue tomorrow.

All in all, this text is inspired by feelings rather than seriousness, by passion rather than reason, by short-term calculations rather than long-term aims. The countries that vote in favour of the text will work against the very cause

which they wish to defend and which we defend as we do the cause of non-proliferation, disarmament and peace.

The Chairman: As no other delegation wishes to speak in explanation of vote before the vote, I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): This may be somewhat anticlimactic but I would like to inform the Committee that the following countries have joined in sponsoring the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/50/L.3: Dominican Republic and Barbados; A/C.1/50/Rev.1: Liechtenstein, Malta and Gabon; A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2: Venezuela, and A/C.1/50/L.45: Honduras.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on the draft resolutions contained in Cluster 1, beginning with draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 entitled "Nuclear testing", which was introduced by the representativeof Mexico at the Committee's 14th meeting on Tuesday, 7 November 1995. It is sponsored by the following States: Antigua and Barbuda, Australia, Barbados, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Fiji, Guatemala, Honduras, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Kyrgyzstan, Maldives, the Marshall Islands, Mexico, the Federated States of Micronesia, Mongolia, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, the Republic of Korea, San Marino, Samoa, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukraine, Uruguay and Venezuela.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested. I call on the Secretary of the Committee to conduct the voting.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guyana, Honduras, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Kazakstan, Kyrgyzstan, Lesotho, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Tajikistan, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, Ukraine, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

China, Côte d'Ivoire, Djibouti, France, Gabon, Mali, Mauritania, Monaco, Niger, Senegal, Togo, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Abstaining:

Afghanistan, Albania, Andorra, Angola, Armenia, Benin, Bulgaria, Burundi, Cameroon, Chad, Congo, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, El Salvador, Estonia, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guinea Bissau, Hungary, Israel, Kenya, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Lithuania, Madagascar, Morocco, Pakistan, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Syrian Arab Republic, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, United States of America, Zaire

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 was adopted by 95 votes to 12, with 45 abstentions.

The Chairman: I now call on those representatives wishing to explain their vote or position.

Mr. Deimundo (Argentina) *(interpretation from Spanish):* The delegation of Argentina would like to state its position on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, on nuclear testing. Taking into account the position we took in our statement to the Rio Group in Quito on 16 June 1995, and in the Declaration of the Fifth Ibero-America Summit Conference held in Bariloci last October, Argentina voted in favour of the draft resolution.

In this connection, Argentina would like once again to state the importance that we attribute to the early conclusion of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of

Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Furthermore, the Republic of Argentina welcomes the commitment by France to accede to the comprehensive test-ban treaty and President Chirac's commitment to eliminate all testing in the future.

Another matter that we find encouraging in this area is the joint statement by the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States in which they made a commitment to sign in the first semester of 1996, the Protocols to the Treaty of Rarotonga on a nuclear-free zone in the South Pacific.

Finally, as regards the fifth paragraph of the preamble, my delegation, while sharing the concerns expressed, considers that it is necessary to have more scientific data in this area.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) *(interpretation from Russian)*: The Russian delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, entitled "Nuclear testing".

We agree with the general thrust of the draft — its intention to conclude a comprehensive test-ban treaty as soon as possible and also its high praise of the actions of the nuclear States which have observed the moratorium.

At the same time, in our view, at this stage when agreement on a comprehensive test-ban treaty is in view, the draft resolution, which does not unite participants parties to the treaty, may turn out to be counter-productive.

Mr. Breitenstein (Finland): My delegation decided to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3 and I should now like to take the opportunity to explain our vote.

Finland has expressed its regret over the nuclear tests which have been conducted in the course of the past few months. Our opposition to any nuclear testing anywhere has been consistent and is therefore well known.

For my Government, however, a comprehensive test-ban treaty is a matter of the highest priority. Only a multilateral agreement providing for the complete cessation of nuclear-test explosions for all time can assure us of a world in which nuclear-test explosions will never again be conducted. Regrettably, General Assembly resolutions do not provide such assurances, nor do unilateral moratoria.

My Government participates actively in the negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty within the Conference on Disarmament. The international community shares the objective of concluding a comprehensive test-ban treaty in 1996. The draft resolution on which we have just voted fails, regrettably, to recognize and express support for this objective.

In addition, we note that the draft resolution omits any mention of the significant progress achieved within the Conference on Disarmament thus far. The declarations by four nuclear-weapon States in support of the true zero-yield option have generated significant positive momentum in the Geneva negotiations. This momentum should have been given the credit it deserves in the draft resolution.

Furthermore, in our view, the draft resolution reflects inaccurately an important consensus outcome of the 1995 Review and Extension Conference on the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The nuclear-weapon States committed themselves to exercise utmost restraint in nuclear testing. It is not in the interest of the international community to give credence to an implication that NPT commitments have been or are somehow being violated.

Finland will continue to voice its opposition to any nuclear-test explosions and will continue to stress the primacy of the comprehensive test-ban treaty negotiations as the means for dealing with nuclear explosions and will give credit to any progress achieved towards our common goal. It is regrettable that the draft resolution only addresses admittedly serious yet momentary concerns while ignoring the objective which we all share.

The Chairman: I now call on the representative of Luxembourg, who will speak on behalf of the Benelux countries.

Mr. Wolzfeld (Luxembourg) *(interpretation from French)*: I am honoured to speak on behalf of the Benelux countries — Belgium, Netherlands and Luxembourg.

It was with great difficulty that our countries finally decided to vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, on nuclear testing — not because we have any doubt about what we think about the continuation of these tests in the post-cold-war period. We have repeatedly deplored these tests. They seem to us to belong to another era and to involve risks which we were ready to run when the bloc confrontations imperilled our existence, but in the new era in which we now live they seem to us superfluous. The three Benelux countries deplore these tests and do so without hesitation.

Public opinion in our countries has often expressed itself vehemently against these tests and in democratic countries like our own, Governments cannot disregard such feelings and such messages.
The Benelux countries wish, however, to express their view calmly and objectively.

We should also like to point out how disturbed we are at the inadequacies of the text. The Benelux countries intend to refrain from emotional and transient reactions. We regret the excesses of all kinds to which this matter has recently given rise. Different views of an issue, no matter how important, cannot justify some of the turbulence we have been witnessing.

Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg cannot forget the ties of friendship between us and certain countries which are particularly affected by these lapses of conduct. We would have liked to see more restraint exercised by all delegations and the adoption of a less selective approach to nuclear tests.

In the immediate future, nuclear disarmament will be dominated by the negotiation of a treaty banning all tests. In this regard we welcome the undertakings as to the date of the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty, including undertakings by States which are still conducting tests. We are not forgetting, however, that in this regard France was the first to make a commitment without reservation.

Furthermore, our vote in favour of the draft resolution should not lead the Committee to believe that we are endorsing its imperfections. They are quite considerable. It is indeed unfortunate that it was deemed necessary to specify the date scheduled for the conclusion of negotiations. Obviously, such an omission is not due to inadvertence. It presupposes an approach to negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty which we do not share. This treaty, for some time to come, benefits from the momentum imparted to it by the happy outcome of the Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). This momentum guarantees success for us in the months to come, and advantage must be taken of this momentum. To ignore this date may give rise to doubts as to our willingness to conclude this Treaty within the schedule established by the international community. For our three countries and for many others this is an important objective.

It is also unfortunate that a document drafted by experts is making wrongful use of the NPT text. In particular, I have in mind the fourth paragraph of the preamble because none of the NPT texts in fact ban nuclear tests. If we deplore them we still refuse to commit ourselves to opportunistic interpretations of important international treaties.

In these circumstances, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg would like to remind the Assembly of their regret at any undertaking which is contrary to our common objective — that of nuclear disarmament. And this was the only reason for our vote today.

Mr. Martínez-Morcillo (Spain)(interpretation from Spanish): The delegation of Spain abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, on nuclear testing. This abstention does not affect the general position of the Spanish Government on nuclear testing, which can be summed up as follows.

The Spanish Government deeply regrets the holding of nuclear tests. It attributes maximum importance and priority to the conclusion of negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty, which should be concluded no later than 1996 to allow for its early signing and entry into force. In these negotiations, my Government unreservedly supports the so-called zero option. My delegation abstained in the vote on this draft resolution because it has certain reservations regarding the interpretation therein of the scope of the decisions and resolutions adopted at the Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

Finally, my delegation wishes to stress that it considers that the negotiations on the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty must be concluded regardless of any temporal circumstances.

Mr. Neagu (Romania): The position of Romania on nuclear testing is well known. My country actively participates in the negotiations with a view to a comprehensive test-ban treaty.

At this stage in the negotiations, it is of crucial importance to avoid any confrontation, condemnation or exclusion, and to concentrate, in a climate of partnership, on all efforts with a view to the conclusion of the drafting of the comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty — by mid-1996, we hope, or even earlier — to ensure the early signing of the treaty by all nuclear-weapon States and its entry into force without delay. It was in order to contribute

to the creation of a political climate conducive to an acceleration of the negotiations on the comprehensive test-ban treaty in Geneva, and to achieve as soon as possible, the elimination and prohibition of all nuclear tests, that my delegation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, on "Nuclear testing".

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): Pakistan has supported the goal of a comprehensive test-ban for the past 30 years. We are happy that the conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty is now in sight. My delegation supports the objectives of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3. We share the desire for the cessation of all nuclear testing. We share the concern for the environment.

However, my delegation was constrained to abstain in the vote on the draft resolution because we think that some of its central provisions reveal an imbalance. In operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would commend the moratorium observed by certain nuclear-weapons States which have conducted almost 2,000 nuclear tests in the past. It would strongly deplore only current nuclear testing. Because of this imbalance, which we believe is unfair, my delegation has been constrained to abstain in the vote.

Mr. Dimitrov (Bulgaria): I would like to explain the position of the delegation of Bulgaria on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3. Bulgaria attaches great importance to the cessation of nuclear testing and has been a long-time supporter of a conclusion of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. The achievement of this goal, in our view, is one of the major means of meeting the security concerns of the international community in the post-cold-war era in the field of nuclear non-proliferation and nuclear disarmament. Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3, however — as became evident during consultations — could not command consensus, which in our view does not contribute to the successful conclusion of the important negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament on the comprehensive test-ban treaty. This is the reason why the Bulgarian delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.3.

The Chairman: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote.

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions contained in cluster 8: draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.13 and the amendments to it, which are contained in document A/C.1/50/L.53; and draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.48.

Are there any delegations wishing to make a statement other than in explanation of vote or position before the voting?

I call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): On behalf of the delegations of Cuba, India, Myanmar, Pakistan and my own delegation, as sponsors of the amendment contained in document A/C.1/50/L.53, I have the privilege of informing the First Committee that, after intense and fruitful consultations with the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.13, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields", we agreed not to press our amendment to action. The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.13 agreed to delete the second preambular paragraph and to make a statement that dispels some of the apprehensions that exist with respect to some of the elements of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.13.

We hope our dialogue on this important issue will continue, with a view to further accommodation and understanding and, we hope, submission of a single resolution on this important issue in coming years. We also encourage the members of the Committee to cast a positive vote on a similar draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.48.

The Chairman: The Committee takes note of the fact that Iran will not press for action on the amendments contained in document A/C.1/50/L.53.

I now call on the representative of Canada.

Mr. Moher (Canada): I would like, first of all, to express my appreciation to our colleague from Iran for the statement that he has just made. As he indicated, a considerable effort has, in fact, been made to find a basis for positive action on this topic. Canada appreciates the efforts made by all delegations in that regard — including those made by the co-sponsors of document A/C.1/50/L.53.

I would also like to express Canada's particular appreciation for the intensive and extremely positive efforts made by the delegation of Brazil, our partner in this endeavour.

I should like to request that all delegations listen carefully, because what I do want to say, with regard to

draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.13, is important. As a result of the discussions that we have had with the co-sponsors of document A/C.1/50/L.53, the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.13 are requesting from the floor the deletion of the second paragraph of the preamble to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.13. This is a significant gesture by the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.13 in the effort to find a consensus on this issue.

I would also like to go on to read a very brief statement, if I may. I make this statement on behalf of all 33 co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.13. The draft resolution contained in A/C.1/50/L.13 clearly refers to two areas in which enhanced bilateral and multilateral dialogues are invited on the role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields.

The first deals with ensuring the implementation of relevant commitments already undertaken under international legal instruments. Examples of such instruments are: the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, and the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction.

The second refers to exploring ways and means of further developing international legal rules on transfers of high technology with military applications. This is a straightforward statement inviting States to continue efforts to find greater international consensus in this field.

This draft resolution does not attempt to address or to resolve significant differences of opinion which exist in this field. In particular, the draft resolution does not deal with the subject of export-control regimes. Many countries, including Canada, consider such regimes as positive and acceptable mechanisms. Other countries, as is well known, disagree with this view. As this draft resolution is an attempt to encourage enhanced dialogues without prejudging their outcomes, it does not address this or other specific issues.

That concludes the brief statement that I wanted to make, Mr. Chairman.

I would like to go on to make two final points. First, it is clear that members of the First Committee are invited to vote according to their national positions on both draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.13 and draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.48. My second point is that — and this is meant very sincerely and very strongly — we would like to express our appreciation, and that of our Brazilian partner, to the 33 co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.13.

The Chairman: The Committee has taken due note of the statement by the representative of Canada, especially in regard to the statement concerning the deletion of the second paragraph of the preamble.

Are there any other statements to be made on the cluster?

If there are none, the Committee will now proceed to hear statements, if any, in explanation of position or vote before action is taken on the draft resolution.

There seem to be none. The Committee will proceed to take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.13.

A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a recorded vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.13, with the revision that was read out by the representative of Canada — that is, the deletion of the second paragraph of the preamble.

In connection with that draft resolution, the Committee will also take note of the fact that, as stated by the representative of Iran, and as agreed by the co-sponsors, the amendment in document A/C.1/50/L.53 will not be pressed to a vote.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany,

Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, France, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Pakistan, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.13, as orally revised, was adopted by 148 votes to none, with 9 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.48. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now commence its voting on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.48, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security and disarmament". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of India at the 16th meeting of the Committee on 8 November 1995. It is sponsored by the following States: Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cuba, Guyana, India, Indonesia, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kenya, Lesotho, Malaysia, Malawi, Nepal, Nigeria, Pakistan, the Philippines and Sri Lanka.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gabon, Gambia, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, Israel, Luxembourg, Netherlands, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakstan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Malta, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Tajikistan, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.48 was adopted by 98 votes to 6, with 51 abstentions.

[Subsequently, the delegation of Myanmar advised the Secretariat that it had intended to vote in favour.]

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their votes or positions.

Mr. Deimundo (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): The delegation of Argentina wishes to state its position on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.13, entitled "The role of science and technology in the context of international security, disarmament and other related fields", which the Committee has just adopted.

We attribute great importance to science and technology, not only as a source of social well-being and economic development, but also as a significant contribution to the full effectiveness and implementation of agreements on the control and limitation of armaments, the conversion of military industry to peaceful uses, and the verification of agreements.

Moreover, as this delegation has already stated in the general debate in this Committee, Argentina would especially like to see the responsible use of technology by all States, and we support the establishment of national and international controls that would prevent the diversion of technology to a proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and conventional weapons that would lead to qualitative improvements that would have destabilizing effects and threaten international peace and security.

In this connection, in order to avoid the transfer of technology for military purposes, we think it is imperative to make sure that this is done in a responsible way, under strict controls which would guarantee its use for strictly peaceful purposes.

Ms. Ghose (India): I should like to explain very briefly my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.13. I should like to thank the delegation of Canada for its efforts to try to resolve what had appeared to be a log-jam. I hope sincerely that next year we can start in time to try to work towards a single draft resolution on this very important subject.

The Chairman: Are there any other statements in explanation of vote? There seem to be none.

We have thus concluded the work for today.

Originally the Committee was scheduled to meet only once tomorrow. I have just been informed that our request for a room for two meetings has been approved; therefore we could have two meetings tomorrow. In that case, I very much hope that the Committee will be able to take action on as many draft resolutions as possible tomorrow.

I should like to consult delegations on the work to be carried out tomorrow. In cluster 1, the Chair proposes to take up the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1, A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2, A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1, A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1. Does any representative have any comments on cluster 1?

Mr. Goonetilleke (Sri Lanka): I should bring it to the notice of the Committee that my delegation has asked that draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1 be reissued for technical reasons. My delegation hopes that the new text will be available tomorrow morning when we are ready to take a vote on the matter.

The Chairman: I am being informed that the corrected version of the text will be available tomorrow morning. In that case the Committee can take up that draft resolution.

If there are no other comments on cluster 1, may we now proceed to cluster 3. In cluster 3 the Chair proposes to take up two draft resolutions: A/C.1/50/L.29/Rev.2 and A/C.1/50/L.45.

I call on the representative of the United States.

Mr. Ledogar (United States): I regret to say that at this time the necessary consultations on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.45, the draft resolution on a moratorium on anti-personnel land-mines, have not been completed and it may be that we will need more time. It is possible that tomorrow this difficulty for us, which is created by proposed amendments, may be compromised, but I cannot say at this time that we will be ready tomorrow. I ask that you, Sir, be prepared to put this issue off until Monday, if necessary.

The Chairman: May I propose that we return to this issue tomorrow morning when we see the results of the consultations. Then perhaps, if the consultations have been fruitful we could take it up tomorrow afternoon.

If there are no other comments on cluster 3, may we move to cluster 7? In cluster 7 the Chair proposes to take up the following draft resolutions: A/C.1/50/L.24, A/C.1/50/L.28/Rev.1 and A/C.1/50/L.31/Rev.1.

If there are no comments on cluster 7, may we proceed to cluster 8? In cluster 8 the Chair proposes to take up draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.41/Rev.1. Are there any comments?

Mr. García (Colombia) (*interpretation from Spanish*): In regard to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.41/Rev.1, consultations are still going on. It is possible that significant progress will be made but it would be a good idea nevertheless to consider postponing this draft resolution until next Monday.

The Chairman: Perhaps we could also refer back to that draft resolution tomorrow morning. If the consultations have been completed we may take it up in the afternoon also. If not we will probably have to defer action on it until Monday.

Let us now move to cluster 11. In cluster 11 the Chair proposes to take up draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.7 and the amendments to that draft resolution contained in A/C.1/50/L.58, and draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.25. Are there any comments on cluster 11?

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): I should just like to point out that a revised version of the amendments proposed to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 has been issued, in document A/C.1/50/L.58/Rev.1.

The Chairman: Then A/C.1/50/L.58/Rev.1 will be taken up tomorrow.

I call on the representative of Japan.

Mr. Yamamoto (Japan): My delegation does not wish action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 to be postponed until Monday. We request that the Secretariat make the necessary arrangements.

I would ask the co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 to meet immediately after the adjournment of this meeting since a new amendment to A/C.1/50/L.7 has been proposed.

The Chairman: Note has been taken of the request from the representative of Japan and the co-sponsors of that draft resolution. Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 will receive the same treatment. We will refer back to that draft resolution tomorrow to see if progress has been made and whether there is also a possibility of taking it up tomorrow afternoon.

I shall now call on the Secretary of the Committee to make some announcements.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): We have been requested to make the following announcements.

There will be a meeting of the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement of the First Committee on First Committee matters tomorrow at 9 a.m. in Conference Room D. There will also be a meeting of the countries of the Non-Aligned Movement in this Conference Room immediately following the adjournment of this meeting.

I know that the representative of Japan has also announced that a meeting would be held in this room. We will see what arrangements can be made.

The Chairman: Tomorrow the Committee will take up the following draft resolutions:

In cluster 1: A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1, A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2, A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1 and A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1;

In cluster 3: A/C.1/50/L.29/Rev.2 -- on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.45 representatives have heard the request from the United States delegation;

In cluster 7: A/C.1/50/L.24, A/C.1/50/L.28/Rev.1, A/C.1/50/L.31/Rev.1;

In cluster 8: the consultations on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.41/Rev.1 are still going on and the same will apply to that draft resolution. We may not be able to take it up tomorrow afternoon.

In cluster 11 there has also been a request to postpone action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.7 and the amendment in A/C.1/50/L.58/Rev.1 until Monday. We will also revert to this issue tomorrow if the consultations are fruitful. If not, we may have to defer the decision on A/C.1/50/L.7 until Monday. Tomorrow we will take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.25.

The meeting rose at 5.35 p.m.

United Nations A/C.1/50/PV.25

General Assembly

Official Records

Fiftieth session

First Committee

25th Meeting

Friday, 17 November 1995, 10 a.m.

New York

Chairman: Mr. Erdenechuluun (Mongolia)

The meeting was called to order at 11.30 a.m.

Agenda items 57 to 81 *(continued)*

Action on draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman: At this meeting the Committee will proceed to take a decision on draft resolutions which appear in the following clusters.

Cluster 1: draft resolutions A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1, A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2, and A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1. As far as A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1 is concerned, we are having consultations with the sponsors and other interested delegations as to when we are going to take up this draft resolution.

Cluster 3: A/C.1/50/L.29/Rev.2 and A/C.1/50/L.45.

Cluster 7: A/C.1/50/L.28/Rev.1. As far as A/C.1/50/L.24 and A/C.1/50/L.31/Rev.1 are concerned, we will probably have to take them up this afternoon because we are still waiting for the statement on financial implications. So the Chair is planning to take up those two resolutions — A/C.1/50/L.24 and A/C.1/50/L.31/Rev.1 — this afternoon when we receive the programme budget implications.

Cluster 11: we will have to defer action on A/C.1/50/L.25 until Monday, upon the request of the sponsors of the draft resolution. As far as A/C.1/50/L.7 is concerned, if consultations are conclusive by this afternoon, we may take it up then. I will keep the Committee informed about the developments of this draft resolution.

I call on the representative of Egypt.

Mr. Abdel Aziz (Egypt): We are of course willing to pursue all possible means of informal consultations on A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1, but we would also like to stress the fact that by the afternoon we will be in a position to take up this draft resolution, and we hope that all necessary consultations will be conducted from now until early afternoon. We maintain the view that this draft resolution should be taken up this afternoon.

The Chairman: The Chair is doing its utmost to marry conflicting views on this particular issue and will certainly try to arrive at a mutually accommodating solution to this issue.

Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision on the draft resolutions contained in cluster 1, I shall call upon those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions.

I call on the representative of Sri Lanka to introduce the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1.

Mr. Goonetilleke (Sri Lanka): Sri Lanka has asked to speak to introduce resolution A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1, on the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. The draft resolution has been reissued for technical reasons.

95-86720 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

The year 1995 has been a momentous one, particularly for the States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. After going through a preparatory process, both in New York and Geneva, 175 States parties to the Treaty met in New York in April this year for the purpose of reviewing and taking a decision on the question of extending the most widely adhered to treaty by the international community. The outcome of the Conference is widely known and therefore I do not have to go into that matter now.

In its capacity as the country which had the honour and the privilege of providing the President of the Conference, Ambassador Jayantha Dhanapala, Sri Lanka thought it appropriate that at its fiftieth session the General Assembly should take note of this historic event jointly arrived at by the States parties to the Treaty. The intention of my delegation was to present a procedural draft resolution which would have allowed the General Assembly to take note of the principal decisions taken by the Conference. However, after consultations involving all interested parties, Sri Lanka was able to reformulate the draft resolution as seen in document A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1. Before proceeding any further, I should like to thank all delegations which took part in the consultations and extended their cooperation, without which it would not have been possible for me to present the draft resolution to the First Committee.

May I draw the attention of the members to the draft resolution. In operative paragraphs 1 and 2, the resolution takes note of the fact that on 11 May 1995 parties to the Treaty adopted three decisions and a resolution, namely, decisions on strengthening the review process for the disarmament; on principles and objectives for nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament; and on extension of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons; and the resolution on the Middle East. In adopting these two operative paragraphs, the General Assembly will be taking note of the principal decisions taken by the Review and Extension Conference.

Operative paragraph 3 is important in that in it the Assembly would note other main decisions taken by the States parties to the Conference.

Subparagraph (a) refers to the agreement to strengthen the review process for the operation of the Treaty with a view to assuring that the purposes of the preamble and the provisions of the Treaty are being realized. The subparagraph also details the action that should be taken to fulfil the review process. The content of subparagraph (a) was taken from paragraphs 1 and 2 of decision 1 referred to in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

Subparagraph (b) is an affirmation of the need to continue to move with determination towards the full realization and effective implementation of the provisions of the Treaty for which the States parties to the Treaty adopted a set of principles and objectives. The language of this subparagraph is drawn from decision 2 referred to in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

Reference is made in subparagraph (c) to the manner in which the decision to extend the Treaty indefinitely was taken. For this purpose, the language appearing in the final paragraph of decision 3, referred to in paragraph 1, was utilized.

In this manner the draft resolution has attempted to find a careful balance of what was stated in the three decisions referred to in paragraph 1.

Sri Lanka is aware of the fact that the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) was an event involving States parties to the Treaty.

My delegation is well aware of the fact that among us there are States that are non-party to the Treaty. Notwithstanding this fact, it is my delegation's hope that the States non-parties to the Treaty will be gracious enough to permit the draft resolution to be adopted without a vote. However, if there is a request for a vote, my delegation earnestly requests the States parties to the Treaty, who represent the overwhelming majority of the international community, to vote *en bloc* in favour of the draft resolution.

Finally, it should be stated for the record that many delegations expressed their desire to join in sponsoring the draft resolution. In spite of their commitment to non-proliferation, those delegations graciously stood aside to permit my delegation to hold consultations and finalize the draft resolution. While we appreciate their cooperation I wish to express my sincere thanks particularly to the delegations of Bangladesh and South Africa for the support given to my delegation by their sponsorship of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: I will now call on those delegations wishing to make statements other than explanations of their positions on draft resolutions contained in cluster 1.

Ms. Ghose (India): My delegation wishes to make a few general and specific comments on the issues and draft resolutions which we are about to consider in cluster 1.

I should like first of all to make a specific comment on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.8. This draft resolution is, in our view, an extremely important one and my delegation has in the past joined in sponsoring resolutions on the subject of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. In view of our intense and sincere involvement in the negotiations on that treaty in the Conference on Disarmament, we would have wished to join in sponsoring the draft resolution this year as well.

However, as we stated in the General Assembly and in the Committee, there has been a change in the international context this year. The indefinite extension of the NPT, followed by nuclear testing by some nuclear-weapon States and announcements of proposed non-explosive tests and reiteration of the maintenance of doctrines of deterrence by others, must lead all who are negotiating in Geneva to reassess and re-examine the situation with which they are faced. It cannot be "business as usual".

We feel that without disrupting ongoing negotiations, it is absolutely essential to locate the comprehensive test-ban treaty in the context of an overall programme for nuclear disarmament which, given the indefinite extension of the NPT, would have to be in a reasonable or specific time-frame.

Therefore, my delegation had proposed to the original sponsors a simple preambular paragraph which would have located the comprehensive test-ban treaty as a significant disarmament step in a phased programme leading eventually to the total elimination of nuclear weapons in a specific or even reasonable time-frame. Unfortunately, the sponsors were unable to accept the concept, let alone the text. Not wishing to hold up consensus on the draft resolution we regretfully withdrew our proposal but were unable to join the other sponsors as a sponsor. We will, of course, be pursuing the substantive issue in the negotiations in Geneva.

We recognize the need for intensive negotiations on the treaty in the coming months with the objective of obtaining a good and meaningful legally binding agreement that would enable all countries to voluntarily enter into the obligations being negotiated.

We place more emphasis on the quality and content of the final product than on the date on which the Treaty is completed. However desirable it may be to achieve a conclusion to the negotiations at the earliest feasible date, we will concentrate our efforts on ensuring that what is finally achieved truly serves the interests of peace and national and international security.

There are other draft resolutions which are being considered under this cluster today and I would like to make the following comments on the issues raised as a whole.

All of the draft resolutions, in one way or another, seek to bring into General Assembly resolutions concepts and language from a non-United Nations intergovernmental conference to which it happens we were not a party. We have already indicated our stand on this issue in previous draft resolutions. Let me state once again very clearly and as honestly as I can. India is not, and does not intend to become, party to the NPT, which we consider unequal and discriminatory. Now that it has been extended indefinitely, less so if that is possible.

We do not, and cannot, accept the logic that a few nations have the right to pursue their security by threatening the survival of mankind, nor is it acceptable that those who possess nuclear weapons are freed of all controls while those without are policed against their production. History is full of such prejudices paraded as iron laws: that men are superior to women; that white races are superior to the coloured; that colonialism is a civilizing mission, and that those who possess nuclear weapons are responsible Powers and those who do not, are not. The latter is a quotation from a speech made almost ten years ago by a former Prime Minister of my country and we believe that this is true even today. We recognize the sovereign right of every country to take such measures as it deems fit in the interests of its own security in the overall context of international peace and security. We expect that it will be recognized that we too have that right.

Therefore, by urging States not parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to sign the Treaty by welcoming the indefinite extension or reaffirming decisions to which we were not a party is, to say the least, neither logical nor serious.

We will therefore indicate our view on the three draft resolutions in this cluster appropriately and will be explaining our vote after the decisions are taken.

Mr. Bishop (Canada): Canada wishes briefly to make several key points on nuclear issues following upon its opening statement made to the Committee on 20 October 1995.

Those points are the following. Canada continues to attach great importance to the full implementation of the results of the May 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). In that respect, the undertakings with regard to nuclear disarmament as set out in that Treaty and in the Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament must be fulfilled with determination, and an effective comprehensive test-ban treaty must, in our view, be completed as soon as possible in 1996.

With regard to the last point, Canada regrets that we were unable to agree on a realistic deadline of 30 June 1996 for completion of the final text of a comprehensive test-ban treaty. That deadline continues to be one towards which Canada will work.

In this overall context, Canada is, as we stated earlier, encouraged by the commitment of the United States, the United Kingdom and France to a true zero-yield comprehensive test-ban treaty. This bottom line on scope must be fully observed.

We also once again welcome the progress being made on nuclear-weapon-free zones, including the statement by France that France, the United States and the United Kingdom intend to adhere to the Treaty of Rarotonga. We intend to support draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.23 on an African nuclear-weapon-free zone.

Finally, we hope for, and strongly urge, further progress in the field of nuclear reduction, including reductions in the START context, by all nuclear-weapon States.

The Chairman: Does any other delegation wish to speak?

If not, we have just received a request from the delegation of Egypt to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1. Accordingly, I now call on the representative of Egypt.

Mr. Elaraby (Egypt): I have the honour to introduce, on behalf of the sponsors, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1, entitled "The risk of nuclear proliferation in the Middle East".

This revised text takes into account the views expressed by many interested delegations in the First Committee. It was revised following broad and extensive consultations with many delegations. I hope it will be realized that it is a clear demonstration of the flexibility and good faith of the sponsors in addressing this important issue.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1 is one of the many efforts to strengthen the non-proliferation regime. It does so by advocating universality of the NPT at the regional level in the Middle East — an objective that is shared and fully supported by the international community as a whole. Suffice it to refer to the resolution on the Middle East which was sponsored by three nuclear-weapon States and adopted by the Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) last May, and which is referred to in the preamble of the draft resolution.

In the final analysis, the draft resolution should be regarded as an invitation to all States in the Middle East to join a club — the NPT club. We believe that all parties to the NPT have a collective responsibility to support all efforts aimed at strengthening the non-proliferation regime.

The goal of universal adherence to the NPT in the Middle East is within our reach. Accession by the United Arab Emirates in September 1995 has brought one State closer to the realization of this objective. The sponsors of the draft resolution would like to register here, today, their sincere hope that this lofty goal will be attained in the very near future thereby marking the dawn of a new era in the Middle East.

In conclusion, may I express the hope that the draft resolution will not be presented at future sessions — that by the next session all States in the Middle East will be parties to the NPT.

The Chairman: I now call on the representative of the United States to make a statement.

Mr. Ledogar (United States): I wish to make a brief statement with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1, on the comprehensive test-ban treaty.

My Government is one of the sponsors of this draft resolution. It is an extremely important draft resolution —

dealing with one of the most important items we are considering in this Committee. It is a draft resolution that addresses a development, not one that is distant and desirable, but one that is momentous, historical and close at hand and it enjoys very broad support. Obviously, it had to result in compromises of different points of view, particularly over the timetable for the achievement of success in the Treaty.

President Clinton has proposed that we set for ourselves a timetable for the completion of the negotiations by April 1996 in order to have the treaty conformed, translated and, indeed, set in concrete by 30 June so that there could be a resumed session of the General Assembly for the purpose of considering a draft resolution and propagating the text so that the treaty itself could be opened for signature at the very beginning of the fifty-first session of the General Assembly — that is, in September 1996.

That is the American proposed timetable. Obviously, not all delegations shared that view and we have had to make compromises in the development of the text of the draft resolution but I would like to state once again, and for the record, my Government's approach: it relates particularly to the wording of paragraphs 2 and 4 of the draft resolution, which we will of course support.

The Chairman: If no other delegation wishes to speak on cluster 1, the Committee will proceed now to hear the statements of delegations in explanation of vote or position before the voting.

As draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.19/Rev.1 will have to be discussed at a later stage, I should like to ask those delegations wishing to explain their votes before the voting to do so at an appropriate time.

Mr. Sha Zukang (China) (*interpretation from Chinese*): My understanding is that we are making explanatory statements before the voting.

I wish to make some comments to explain the Chinese delegation's position concerning draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1, on the comprehensive test-ban treaty. The Chinese delegation has consistently held the view that it is a very important treaty. The Chinese delegation has hoped all along that this draft resolution would be adopted by consensus; it had also hoped that China would become one of the sponsors. However, the developments this year are such that the Chinese delegation cannot agree with certain substantive paragraphs in this draft resolution. The Chinese delegation cannot agree to certain elements contained in this year's draft resolution. They relate mainly to the time-frame for the opening of this treaty for signature.

In view of this, the Chinese delegation requests that a separate vote be taken on operative paragraph 2 of this draft resolution and it will abstain on this paragraph. The last sentence of operative paragraph 2 suggests that the comprehensive test ban treaty should be open for signature by the outset of the fifty-first session of the General Assembly. In this regard, I should like to state that the Chinese delegation, like all of the sponsors, also hopes that the comprehensive test-ban treaty will be ready for signature as early as possible.

If it is possible for the treaty to be open for signature at the beginning of the fifty-first session of the General Assembly, that is very good. If it can be ready for signature earlier, that is even better. The Chinese delegation does not completely exclude such a possibility. However, if one should categorically state that this treaty should be opened for signature at the outset of the fifty-first session — if it is not based on any other political motivation — at best it only constitutes a benign good wish. It is really rather baseless. It is really not well-founded. If the Chinese delegation should make a commitment to this, it would be less than earnest, serious or responsible, for the Chinese delegation is not a fortune-teller.

Operative paragraph 4 states that the final text should be completed as soon as possible in 1996. Although this is not the consensual language of the report of the Conference on Disarmament, the Chinese delegation can still accept it. However, if the wording in this paragraph is to be compared with the wording in paragraph 2, it is not difficult to see that these two paragraphs are in conflict with each other. It is completely illogical for these two paragraphs to be included in the same draft resolution. In case the work on the final text of this treaty is not completed, people will ask, "What are you going to present to the States for signature?".

The time-frame specified in operative paragraph 2 will become a blank check — and of course, the Chinese delegation does not wish to see this happen. But what if such a situation arises? In order to avoid such confusion, the Chinese delegation proposed positive amendments to operative paragraph 2. However, they were not accepted by the co-sponsors. On this, the Chinese delegation cannot but feel regret.

The Chinese delegation holds that the comprehensive test-ban treaty is a very important nuclear arms control and disarmament treaty, the negotiation of which is also very important. This treaty will remain in effect indefinitely. In view of this, it is first and foremost of the utmost importance to guarantee the quality of the treaty. Only in such circumstances would the early conclusion and signature of such a treaty be meaningful.

It is known to all that this future treaty will establish its own, independent international verification system and effective on-site verification system. Such a regime will entail a series of political, legal, technical and financial problems. These problems are of a certain degree of complexity and difficulty. Besides, certain problems have still to be settled. The resolution of these problems requires not only political will on the part of the parties, but also a certain amount of time. The Chinese delegation holds that to disregard the realistic requirements of the process of negotiation of this treaty, to speculate and make judgements on the time-frame for the opening of this treaty for signature, and to set a specific date for its signature: all these things do not indicate a realistic and responsible attitude and would not help to promote the process of negotiation.

For the reasons I have stated, the Chinese delegation will abstain in the voting on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1.

We are pleased to learn that progress has already been achieved in the negotiations. China will continue to participate in the negotiations in a positive and constructive manner, and to strive to achieve the conclusion of a satisfactory comprehensive test-ban treaty no later than 1996, or as early as possible.

Mr. Akram (Pakistan): The delegation of Pakistan would like to explain its vote on the three draft resolutions that we will be taking up this morning in the cluster on nuclear items.

First of all, with regard to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1, on a comprehensive test-ban treaty, Pakistan is very appreciative of the fact that progress has been made in the negotiations for the conclusion of the treaty. We hope that we will be able to conclude a treaty that will contribute to both nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. The treaty is now within the grasp of the international community. Of course, a number of issues remain outstanding, including that of its scope. Pakistan is ready for intensive negotiations, on a priority basis, in the Conference on Disarmament in 1996, and we hope that we will be able to conclude the treaty as soon as possible next year. However, our support for this draft resolution and for its various provisions should not be construed as our subscription to artificial deadlines for the conclusion or signature of the treaty.

With regard to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2, introduced by the delegation of Japan and entitled "Nuclear disarmament with a view to the ultimate elimination of nuclear weapons", I should like to make the following remarks.

First of all, my delegation does not question either the honesty or the intentions of the sponsors of this draft resolution. Unfortunately, the provisions of the draft resolution do not match its title. The draft resolution focuses very largely on nuclear non-proliferation rather than on nuclear disarmament. Specifically, we are not a party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, and therefore we cannot subscribe to the provisions of the fourth and fifth preambular paragraphs or to the text of operative paragraph 1. Pakistan will therefore abstain in the voting on these paragraphs if they are voted on separately, and will also abstain on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2 as a whole.

Finally, with regard to the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1, which was introduced earlier today by the representative of Sri Lanka, I should like to say at the outset that we appreciate the fact that the delegation of Sri Lanka closely consulted with my delegation, although we are not a party to the NPT. We see this draft resolution as merely noting the decisions taken by the NPT Review and Extension Conference. We are not a party to these decisions; therefore our decision to support draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.49/Rev.1 in no way constitutes an expression of our position on the substance of the decisions taken, and the documents adopted, at the Review and Extension Conference.

The Chairman: We have heard the last speaker in explanation of vote before the voting.

The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1, entitled "Comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty".

A separate recorded vote has been requested on operative paragraph 2.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1.

We will begin by taking a separate recorded vote on operative paragraph 2.

The draft resolution, entitled "Comprehensive nuclear-test-ban treaty", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the 16th meeting of the Committee, on 8 November 1995. It is sponsored by the following States: Afghanistan, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, the Federated States of Micronesia, Monaco, Mongolia, Myanmar, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Norway, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Peru, the Philippines, Poland, Portugal, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of Moldova, Romania, the Russian Federation, Samoa, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United Republic of Tanzania, the United States of America, Venezuela and Viet Nam.

We will begin by taking a separate recorded vote on operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Djibouti, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

China

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1 was retained by 161 votes to none, with 1 abstention.

The Chairman: May I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution as a whole without a vote? If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1, as a whole, was adopted.

The Chairman: I now call on the representative of Liechtenstein to speak on a point of order.

Mr. Wenaweser (Liechtenstein): I had asked for the floor before the draft resolution was adopted. I just wanted to state that my delegation is a co-sponsor of this draft resolution. This has been read out on previous occasions but not right before we took action on the draft resolution. That is the only point I wanted to make and I would like to ask that my statement be reflected in the record.

The Chairman: The Committee certainly will take note of the statement.

I call on the representative of the Gambia on a point of order.

Mr. Jallow (Gambia): I would like to make a similar request. The Gambia wished to be a co-sponsor of this draft resolution.

The Chairman: Your statement will be appropriately recorded in the proceedings.

I call on the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran on a point of order.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): Similarly, my delegation wishes to state that the Islamic Republic of Iran is also a co-sponsor of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1. We wish that to be reflected in the record.

The Chairman: Your statement will certainly be reflected in the proceedings.

I call on the representative of Malta on a point of order.

Ms. Darmanin (Malta): In a similar vein, we are also co-sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.8/Rev.1.

The Chairman: The statement of the representative of Malta will be appropriately reflected in the proceedings of the First Committee.

I call on the representative of Benin on a point of order.

Mr. W[illegible]annou (Benin) (*interpretation from French*): I would just like to say that we are also co-sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Chairman: Your statement will be appropriately reflected in the records.

If there are no other points of order, I should like to proceed now to call for a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2. In this connection, I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): On draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2, I wish to inform representatives that, as brought to the attention of the Secretariat, a slight technical correction would need to be made in section *(c)* of the sixth preambular paragraph. The word "goal" should be changed to the plural: "goals". Accordingly, section *(c)* reads:

> "The determined pursuit by the nuclear-weapon States of systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate goals of eliminating those weapons, and by all States of general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control,"

The Chairman: I now call on the representative of Mexico on a point of order.

Mr. de Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): This plural is not, as the Secretary of the Committee said, a technical change. As I understand it, what has been reproduced in this text is what was agreed at the Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. I do not remember any plural in it. This is not just a technical change.

The Chairman: In this connection, I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): As you are aware, Mr. Chairman, and as you were privy to this situation, I did mention that it was brought to our attention. I am concerned now, of course, to refer to the fact that — and I am sure they will bear me out on this — the delegation of Japan has asked that this technical correction be made, that the letter "s" be added, that the word "goal" be changed to the plural. So we are following the instructions as discussed with the Secretariat and the Chairman, and as received from the delegation of Japan.

The Chairman: It was my understanding that a revision had been made, adding the letter "s" to the word "goal" in operative paragraph 2, where it calls for the "determined pursuit by the nuclear-weapon States of systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate goals", which is in the

plural, and it is my understanding that this plural was to be repeated in the same manner in the preambular paragraph above. So, from that particular point of view, it was my understanding that "goals", the second change to the word "goal", in the preambular paragraph was to be considered as a technical change rather than anything else. I now call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): I have certainly taken note of the statement of the representative of Mexico and the Chairman has explained as I explained earlier. But I should also point out that, to begin with, the word was "goals" in that particular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.1. Accordingly, I believe that the Japanese delegation brought this to our attention when it submitted A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2, which is now available.

Mr. de Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Operative paragraph 2 was the subject of negotiations between the delegations of Mexico and Japan. It cannot be changed at the last minute. Without an opportunity at this stage to verify the precise language adopted at the Review and Extension Conference of the State Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, my delegation will abstain in the voting on this draft resolution.

Mrs. Kurokochi (Japan): I should like to clarify a point on this paragraph. It is indeed a direct quotation from the Final Document of the NPT Review and Extension Conference. I have with me a copy of the document containing the decision on strengthening the review process for the Treaty. The document is NPT/Conf.95/32 (Part I) of 11 May 1995. This is the decision on "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament". In paragraph 4 *(c)*, the word "goals" appears as follows:

> "The determined pursuit by the nuclear-weapon States of systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate goals of eliminating those weapons ...".

In fact, we confirmed this point with the Secretariat and were certainly given confirmation that this was indeed the wording of this document. As the Secretary of the Committee said, our original draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17 contains the word "goals".

The Chairman: I hope that this will answer the representative of Mexico's question.

Mr. de Icaza (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I believe that there is a very simple solution here. It would appear that the difference is in the Spanish and English versions of the text adopted at the NPT Conference. The word adopted in Spanish was in the singular. I have been told, it has been confirmed, and I believe what the representative of Japan has said that it appears in the plural in English. In that case, I have no objection to the English version of draft resolution A/C.1/50/L.17/Rev.2 keeping the plural, but in the Spanish version we must speak of "*el objetivo*" because it is in the singular.

Mr. Álvarez (Uruguay) (*interpretation from Spanish*): I simply wished to state that the problem does indeed lie in the Spanish version and perhaps in some other versions in which the word appear in the singular. I think that we should stick with what was agreed or we shall end up adopting different texts.

The Chairman: The Spanish version of the draft resolution will be clarified in the context of the Final Document of the Review and Extension Conference. I hope that will satisfy all delegations.

Separate votes on the fifth preambular paragraph and on operative paragraph 1 have been requested —

I call on the representative of the United Kingdom, who wishes to speak on a point of order.

Sir Michael Weston (United Kingdom): I am sorry, but I do think we need to know what it is we are adopting. Are we talking about "goal" or "goals"? As I understand, this issue is still unresolved. I do not think, with the greatest respect for the Ambassador of Mexico, that it is a question of translation, because there is confusion, no doubt as a result of the Secretariat's attempts to reproduce documents in a hurry at the NPT Conference.

There is no doubt at all that, in document A/C.1/50/L.5, it is in the singular in English. It is my belief — and I do not know if anyone else who was concerned with the negotiations on the Principles and Objectives would disagree — that we negotiated "goal" and that is what it was.

But it seems that, between the time of the negotiation and the time of the production of the final documents which were adopted, the Secretariat, as often happens, tried to improve the English and added an "s" because it thought it read better in English. That is my only explanation. We have seen it often; we saw it in draft resolution

A/C.1/50/L.49 in this Committee. On two occasions the sponsor has tried to get the Secretariat to do what he asked them to do, and only in the end did he succeed.

So I think it is a mistake by the Secretariat. But I think we need to sort out whether we are talking about "goal" or "goals".

The Chairman: I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): As to any errors, I would not want to go into details at this point, but we have written confirmation from the Japanese delegation concerning this matter, and that is why we pursued it as we did.

Mr. Goosen (South Africa): I just wanted to state my agreement with the representative of the United Kingdom. I too was involved in the discussions that revolved around this document when it was originally being negotiated, and the word that was negotiated at that time was "goal", not the plural, "goals".

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): I also took part in negotiations on this point, and can confirm what the representatives of the United Kingdom and of South Africa have just said. We certainly negotiated this word in the singular.

The Chairman: I propose to suspend the meeting briefly in order to sort this matter out.

The meeting was suspended at 12.45 p.m. and resumed at 1.10 p.m.

The Chairman: Owing to the lateness of the hour I shall now adjourn this meeting.

The meeting rose at 1.10 p.m.